THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.V.S.RAO

WRIT PETITION No.7944 of 2007

Dated: 19.04.2007

Between:

R. Rangaiah.

..... PETITIONER

AND

The Government of Andhra Pradesh, rep.by its Secretary,
Hyderabad, and others.

.....RESPONDENTS

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.V.S. RAO

WRIT PETITION No.7944 of 2007

ORDER:

The petitioner is resident of Kandiguda Village, Keesara Mandal, Ranga Reddy District. He is allegedly in occupation of Government land admeasuring Ac.1.05 gts in survey No.610 situated at Kapra Village, Keesara Mandal, Ranga Reddy District. He gave a representation on 05.01.1995 seeking a patta, in vain. He then filed W.P.No.3644 of 1995 seeking a writ of Mandamus directing the District Collector, Revenue Divisional Officer(RDO), Mandal Revenue Officer (MRO) to consider his (petitioner's) representation for grant of patta. By order dated 01.03.1995, this Court disposed of the writ petition directing RDO to consider said representation and pass appropriate orders within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a copy of the said order. The petitioner filed yet another writ petition, being W.P.No.4447 of 1997. As alleged in the affidavit accompanying instant writ petition, said writ petition, being W.P.No.4447 of 1997, was also disposed of on 06.03.1997 directing MRO to consider the application of the petitioner within six weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of said order. Now, the petitioner approached second respondent on 15.03.2007 by filing yet another representation requesting regularization of his possession. As there is no response, instant writ petition is filed.

After hearing the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue (General-T), this Court is convinced that this writ petition cannot be accepted. When the order was passed in his favour in March, 1995, directing RDO to consider and dispose of his representation within three months, the petitioner ought to have taken necessary steps to see that necessary order is passed by RDO. Even thereafter also, in March, 1997, MRO was directed to consider his (petitioner's) representation. But the petitioner approached the District Collector, second respondent, only on 15.03.2007 and within a month filed instant writ petition. This Court does not find any gross arbitrariness on the part of second respondent in considering latest representation of the petitioner and the petitioner may pursue the matter with second respondent.

The writ petition, with the above observations, is accordingly dismissed. No costs.

_____

(**V.V.S.RAO, J**)

19th April, 2007

ghn